

**State of Idaho
Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund
Intended Use Plan**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	List of Projects.....	2
III.	Long-term and short-term goals.....	2
	A. Long-term goals	
	B. Short-term goals	
IV.	Information on the SRF activities to be supported.....	3
	A. Allocation of funds	
	B. Administrative costs of the SRF	
	C. Loan eligible activities	
V.	Assurances and specific proposals.....	4
VI.	Criteria and method for distribution of funds.....	5
VII.	Additional information requirements.....	7
	A. Public review and comment	
	B. Bypass procedures	

Attachments

- I. List of Fundable Projects**
- II. State FY 2005 Approved Priority List**
- III. Integrated Priority Rating**
- IV. Proposed Payment Schedule**
- V. Public Participation Information**

**IDAHO REVOLVING FUND
INTENDED USE PLAN
June 2004 BOARD APPROVED**

I. Introduction

The State of Idaho, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), proposes to adopt the following Intended Use Plan (IUP) for state fiscal year 2005 (July 1 through June 30), as required under Section 606c of the Clean Water Act.

The primary purpose of the IUP is to identify the proposed annual intended use of the funds available in Idaho's Water Pollution Control Loan Account. Projects on the priority list, from which this IUP was derived, have been reviewed by the public in accordance with Idaho's Administrative Procedures Act (Idaho Code 67-5201 et. seq.) and approved by the State Board of Environmental Quality.

The IUP includes the following:

- lists of prospective loan projects including payment schedules for those most likely to qualify for a loan
- long-term and short-term goals
- assurances and specific proposals
- criteria and methods for distribution of funds
- attachments relevant to the above

Capitalization of **\$28,516,575** will come from five sources:

1. Idaho's allotment of the FFY2004 appropriation to Title VI programs of **\$6,471,800**.
2. A state match of **\$1,294,360** is being reserved in the Water Pollution Control Account and will be transferred to the Water Pollution Control Loan Account.
3. **\$6,650,958** will come from the SRF Fund. While the fund has a total cash balance of \$67,340,240, \$60,689,462 of that amount must be reserved for disbursement to projects that received loans in prior years but are not completed.
4. Loan repayments and earnings of **\$6,928,172**. \$1,506,887 will accrue during April, May and June of 2004. Another \$5,421,285 will accrue during FY 2005.
5. Interest earnings on the fund balance of **\$1,750,000**. \$350,000 is for the period of April through June of 2004 and \$1,400,000 is for fiscal year 2005.

Available funding is summarized in the following table:

Sources of SRF Funds	Amount
Federal Fiscal Year 2004 Capitalization Grant	\$ 6,471,800
20% State Match	1,294,360
Net cash In the SRF Account as of 3/2004	6,650,958
Loan Repayments 4/01 - 6/01 and 7/01 - 6/2005	6,928,172
Interest Earnings 4/01 - 6/01 and 7/01 - 6/2005	1,750,000
SUBTOTAL	\$28,516,575
Less: Funds Reserved For Administrative Expenses	258,872
Funds Available for New Loans	\$28,257,703

II. List of Projects

Attachment I, List of Fundable Projects, contains the projects expected to be funded that were selected from the FY2005 SRF Project Priority List (Attachment II). Projects are arranged on the list in priority order. Both project lists were presented in a public hearing on May 15, 2004.

The first use requirement of the Act [Section 602(b)(5)], relating to National Municipal Policy (NMP) does not apply in Idaho since all NMP needs have been met with separate funds in the form of state and federal grants and separate state loans in FFY89.

III. Long-and Short-Term Goals

A. Long-Term Goals

1. Protect public health and the waters of the state by offering financial assistance for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities.
2. Assist local communities as they strive to achieve and maintain statewide compliance with federal and state water quality standards.
3. Administer Idaho's Water Pollution Control Loan Account to ensure its financial integrity, viability and revolving nature in perpetuity.

B. Short-Term Goals

1. Perform all necessary tasks to assure that all loan assistance requested from FFY2004 funding is provided for projects on the list in a timely manner.
2. Provide funding for the non-point source projects when they are identified in Attachment I.
3. Address long-term funding for SRF administrative costs when capitalization grants are no longer provided. This goal is carried over from the previous fiscal year. While some possible alternatives have been explored, a permanent solution has not been determined.
 - Determine a source of funding administrative costs
 - Submit legislation to establish authorization

IV. Information on the Activities to be Supported

A. Allocation of Funds

The primary type of assistance to be provided by the SRF is expected to be low interest loans for up to 100% of project costs. The rate of interest in State FY2005 will be 3.25% for loans awarded directly by DEQ. Loans to the Idaho Soil Conservation Commission will be at 2%. All loans will be paid back over a period not to exceed 20 years. Principal and interest repayments must begin no later than one year after the initiation of operation date.

B. Administrative Costs of the SRF

DEQ plans to reserve not more than four percent of the capitalization grant for administrative expenses.

C. Loan Eligible Activities

SRF loans will provide for planning, design and construction of secondary, advanced secondary, interceptors and appurtenances for infiltration/inflow correction, collector sewers and rehabilitation. SRF loan assistance will be provided to local communities, counties, sewer districts, and non-profit sewer associations for the construction of publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities. Loans may also be provided to sponsors of non-point source projects to implement water pollution control projects. Such projects must be consistent with the State Water Quality Management Plan and demonstrate a nexus or benefit to a municipality.

V. Assurances and Specific Proposals

A. Environmental Reviews - 602(a)

DEQ certifies that it will conduct environmental reviews of each wastewater treatment project receiving assistance from the SRF. DEQ will follow EPA approved NEPA-like procedures in conjunction with environmental reviews.

These procedures are outlined in Section 01.12041 of the state Rules for Administration of Water Pollution Control Loans. More detailed procedures are embodied in the Wastewater Facilities Loan Account Handbook of Procedures (Chapter 5).

B. Binding Commitments - 602(b)(3)

DEQ will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly payment within one year of receipt of that payment. Binding commitment dates are listed in Section VI of this plan.

C. Expeditious and Timely Expenditures - 602(b)(4)

DEQ will expend all funds in the SRF in a timely and expeditious manner.

D. First Use Enforceable Requirements - 602(b)(5)

DEQ certifies that all major and minor WWTFs that the state has previously identified as part of the National Municipal Policy Universe are:

- (a) in compliance, or
- (b) on an enforceable schedule, or
- (c) have an enforcement action filed, or
- (d) have a funding commitment during or prior to the first year covered by an IUP.

E. Compliance with Title II Requirements - 602(b)(6)

DEQ believes it has met the specific statutory requirements for publicly-owned wastewater treatment projects constructed in whole or in part before FY 1995 with funds directly made available by federal capitalization grants. Therefore, DEQ no longer plans to use its federal capitalization grant and state match on "equivalency projects". These projects meet the sixteen specific statutory requirements provided by Section 602(b)(6) of the Clean Water Act as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1987, Public Law 100-4 and are eligible under 201(b), 201(g)(1) and (2), 201(N) and 211.

However, DEQ agrees to comply with and to require recipients of loans from Idaho's Water Pollution Control Loan Account to comply with applicable federal cross-cutting requirements. DEQ will notify EPA when consultation or coordination by EPA is necessary to resolve issues regarding these requirements.

F. State Matching Funds - 602(b)(2)

DEQ agrees to deposit into the SRF from state monies an amount equal to twenty percent of the capitalization grant on or before the date on which the state receives each cash draw from EPA. These funds will be transferred from Idaho's Water Pollution Control Account.

G. State Laws and Procedures - 602(b)(7)

DEQ agrees to expend each quarterly grant payment in accordance with state laws and procedures.

H. Consistency with Planning

DEQ agrees that it will not provide assistance to any wastewater treatment project unless that project is consistent with plans developed under Section 205(j), 208, 303(e), 319, or 320.

I. National Reporting Needs

DEQ agrees to provide data or information to EPA as may be required for national reports, public inquiries, or Congressional inquiries.

VI. Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds

The following principles and procedures will be the basis for the administration, funding, allocation and distribution of the SRF monies. They are designed to provide maximum flexibility for assistance and assure long-term viability of the revolving program.

A. Program Administration

Four percent of the capitalization grant provided by EPA will be set aside to be used for program administration.

B. SRF Priority List

Letters of Interest were sent to all cities, counties and water and sewer districts in the state. Returned Letters of Interest and priority list rating forms were sent to Project Engineers in DEQ regional offices to complete a rating of projects in each region. The result of the rating and ranking was the preliminary priority list that was presented at the public hearing. Separate Letters of Interest were sent to potential non-point source applicants.

Projects are rated using the following criteria:

1. 150 points Public health emergency certified by the DEQ Board or a Health District Board
2. 0 to 100 points Watershed restoration
3. 0 to 100 points Watershed protection
4. 0 to 100 points Preventing impacts to uses
5. 0 to 100 points Secondary incentive ranking points

Attachment III contains the guidance document which fully explains how DEQ staff applied the above criteria when rating individual projects.

C. Fundable Projects

The highest rated projects on the adopted Priority List that are ready to proceed are selected for funding and are listed on the IUP. These fundable projects are listed on Attachment I. DEQ staff starts at the top of the Priority List and works as far down the list as needed to select enough projects that are ready to proceed to use all of the funds that are available. In cases where a lower ranked project is selected it is because higher ranked projects have not indicated a readiness to proceed.

In some cases the project amount on Attachment I may be less than the project amount on the Priority List. The Priority List amount is the estimate of the total project cost, while the costs on Attachment I are the amount that project applicants expect to borrow from the SRF. In each case the difference will be provided from some other source such as cash on hand or a grant from the Community Development Block Grant program administered by the Idaho Department of Commerce.

D. Disbursements

The estimated timing and amount of disbursements for the projects on the new IUP are added to the latest cash disbursement request projections for prior year funded and projected projects. The projections are normally provided to EPA in July each year. The projections are based upon estimated disbursement schedules submitted by loan recipients and projected timing of loan agreements, adjusted for corrections by regional project engineers and state office staff. These disbursements are tracked on an on-going basis to project needed cash from all capitalization grants and state match. All funds will be expended in an expeditious and timely manner.

E. Federal Payments

Idaho's proposed payment schedule for each capitalization grant is based upon the projected timing of signed loan agreements with projects listed on the current and prior IUPs. This allows for adjustment of prior IUP projects to be reflected in the federal payment schedule.

F. State Match

Idaho's match for all capitalization grants is provided from funds that are drawn from the state Water Pollution Control Account. The Water Pollution Control Account derives its funding from a set amount of \$4.8 million from the state sales tax and is perpetually appropriated to DEQ under Idaho Code Title 63, Chapter 36.

VII. Additional Information Requirements

A. Public Review and Comment

Projects on the FY2005 SRF List of Fundable Projects and Project Priority List were approved by the DEQ Board at the 6/ /2004 meeting. Copies of the list were made available in the regional and state offices thirty days in advance of the hearing date. Also, notices of the priority list review process were printed in major Idaho newspapers at least 21 days prior to the hearing date. At the Boise hearing, DEQ delivered a thorough discussion of its intent to develop a priority list and IUP for the low-interest revolving loan program. This message was also included in public notices sent to Idaho newspapers and to a large list of private interested parties such as consulting engineers, local governments, and local government advocacy groups.

In addition to the above, the draft Intended Use Plan including the Fundable List and Project Priority List was posted on the DEQ website during the comment period.

B. Bypass Procedures

A project that does not or will not meet the project target date or a DEQ schedule that allows for timely utilization of loan funds may be bypassed, substituting in its place the next highest ranking project(s) that is ready to proceed (Rules IDAPA 16.01.12020,06). DEQ intends to utilize priority list ranking as much as possible when preparing the Intended Use Plan. However the lack of adequate funding, changes in project scopes, failure to pass a bond election, or other unforeseen circumstances may require that a project on the Intended Use Plan be removed. If a project is removed, DEQ will offer loan funds to the highest ranked, ready to proceed project from the most current approved Priority List.

**ATTACHMENT I:
LIST OF FUNDABLE PROJECTS**

Project	Priority List Number	Loan Amount	Binding Commitment Date
Administration		\$ 258,872	9/04
Fish Haven Rec. W&S	1	2,000,000	9/04
Southside W&S District*	2	900,000	3/05
St. Anthony, City of	3	3,500,000	3/05
Shelley, City of*	4	1,300,000	7/04
Moscow, City of*	5	3,000,000	9/04
Rupert, City of#	6	12,200,000	7/04
Filer, City of	7	3,146,800	12/04
Jerome, City of#	8	2,210,903	7/04
Total		\$ 28,516,575	

* Projects carried forward from Prior Year

Loan applications for these projects have been received.

Descriptions of the projects listed above are provided on the following pages.

LIST OF FUNDABLE PROJECTS - PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

Fish Haven Recreation W&S District (Bear Lake County, Pocatello Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> The District will use loan funds to upgrade the existing wastewater treatment facility to address hydraulic overloading problems with the existing lagoons.	\$2,000,000
Southside Water and Sewer District (Bonner County, Coeur d'Alene Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> The District is completing a planning study to identify alternatives for upgrading their existing wastewater treatment facility to comply with the schedule in their Land Application Permit and to serve their 20-year design population.	\$900,000
City of St. Anthony (Fremont County, Idaho Falls Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> St. Anthony will use the loan funds for design and construction of an upgrade to their existing collection and treatment system. The includes approximately 53,000 feet of the collection system and associated manholes, lagoon improvements, chlorination to help meet permit limits, new headworks, installation of flow measurement equipment and refurbishing the turbine in the North Fork of the Snake River.	\$3,500,000
City of Shelley (Bingham County, Pocatello Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> The City will use the loan funds for the first phase of design and construction of a regional wastewater treatment facility. The facility will serve the City of Shelley, South Bonneville County, North Bingham County and the City of Ammon.	\$1,300,000
City of Moscow (Latah County, Lewiston Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> Moscow's wastewater treatment facility that was placed on line in October 2001 but will likely not meet the effluent limits for phosphorus in 2004. This loan will allow the city to design and construct phosphorus removal.	\$3,000,000
City of Rupert (Minidoka County, Twin Falls Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> These loan funds will allow the City of Rupert to replace the existing lagoon system with a new mechanical treatment facility as well the correction of inflow and infiltration problems in the collection system. This new system will address corrective measures identified in the Odor Management Plan.	\$12,200,000
City of Filer (Twin Falls County, Twin Falls Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> The City of Filer needs to upgrade their collection system and treatment facility. This includes installation of a comminutor at the headworks, upgrading aeration and removal of sludge from cells 1 and 2 and installation of flow monitoring equipment. This project will help address conditions in the City's new generation land application permit.	\$3,146,800
City of Jerome (Jerome County, Twin Falls Regional Office) <i>Sec.212.</i> The City will add new aeration to existing treatment facilities and will add new aeration basins to handle an increasing load of wastewater to the facility. Jerome will also develop new biosolids handling facilities. The project will help the city meet TMDL requirements for the middle Snake River as well as addressing conditions in the Odor Management Plan.	\$2,210,903

**ATTACHMENT II:
FY 2005 STATE WASTEWATER LOAN PRIORITY LIST**

WW LOAN

Rank	Project	FY 2005 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit No.	BOD	SS
1	Fish Haven Recreational Sewer District	146	PRO	2,000,000	I	Upgrade existing wastewater treatment facility.	4	No discharge		
2	Southside Water and Sewer District	130	CRO	900,000	I,II	Add seasonal (Summer) discharge to the Pend Orielle River.	4	No discharge		
3	City of St. Anthony	130	IFRO	3,500,000	I, IIIB	Upgrade Existing collection and Treatment System.	4	ID0020401	45	70
4	Shelley	129	PRO	1,300,000	I,IVA,IVB	Construct regional wastewater treatment facility.	4	ID0020133	45	70
5	City of Moscow	121	LRO	3,000,000	I	Construct an effluent filtration system.	4	ID0021491	30	30
6	City of Rupert	115	TFRO	12,200,000	I,IIIA	Replace an existing lagoon system with a mechanical facility and correct I/I problems in the collection system.	4	No discharge		
7	City of Filer	104	TFRO	3,146,800	I,IIIB	Upgrade collection, install comminutor at the headworks, upgrade the aeration in cells #1 and #2, remove sludge from cells #1 and #2, install flow monitoring, address BOD and TSS limits, perform seepage testing in lagoons.	4	ID0020061	30	70
8	City of Jerome	99	TFRO	3,900,000	II	Treatment upgrade, install membrane technology.	4	ID002016	30	30
9	North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District. Tamarack Phase II	93	BRO	1,450,000	I,IVA	Install sewers in Tamarack - Phase II.	4	No discharge		
10	North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District.	91	BRO	1,000,000	I	Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion.	4	No discharge		

Rank	Project	FY 2005 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit No.	BOD	SS
11	North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District.	91	BRO	700,000	IVA	Install Sewers in Smiling Julie and Westwood Subdivisions.	4	No discharge		
12	North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District	91	BRO	1,362,000	IVA	Install Sewers in Royal Scott Subdivision.	4	No discharge		
13	City of Meridian	89	BRO	13,410,000	I	Construct Phase I WWTP improvements: one new 80-foot diameter primary clarifier, one new aeration basin and upgrade two existing basins, one new 100-foot diameter secondary clarifier, new secondary pump station, tertiary filter addition, one new 65-foot digester with new digester building for biosolids stabilization, new sludge dryer and other miscellaneous improvements.	4	ID0020192	20	30
14	City of Ketchum	89	TFRO	7,440,000	I	Upgrade electrical and instrumentation at existing plant, add ultraviolet disinfection, add an aeration basin, and add filters to help the plant meet TSS limit.	4	ID0020281	30	30
15	North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District	86	BRO	400,000	IVA	Install sewers in the SISCRA Recreational Vehicle Park.	4	No discharge		
16	Stanley Sewer Assoc.	86	IFRO	230,000	IVA	Rehabilitate existing sewers, manholes, and lift stations.	4	No discharge		
17	City of Hazelton	86	TFRO	2,000,000	I,IIIB	Replace and rehabilitate sewer lines, realign sewer lines, install additional sewer lines, upgrade lift stations, upgrade headworks, and expand lagoons and land application site.	4	No discharge		
18	City of Hailey	79	TFRO	600,000	IIIB	Repair collection system.	4	ID0020303	30	30

Rank	Project	FY 2005 Rating	Regional Office	DEQ Est. Loan Amt.	Needs Cat.	Project Description	Step	Discharge Permit No.	BOD	SS
19	City of Lapwai	74	LRO	5,000,000	I,IVB	Construct a new wastewater treatment plant and transmission lines.	4	No discharge		
20	City of Ashton	71	IFRO	1,000,000	I, IIIB	Replace collection lines and upgrade treatment and land application.	4	ID0023710	30	30
21	Bear Lake West Homeowners	70	POC	125,000	IVB	Install additional sewers on Bear Lake West HOA properties.	4	No discharge		
22	City of Spirit Lake	66	CRO	600,000	I	Install septage-receiving facilities, add one more fine screen, rehabilitate cell 1 and add aeration to cells 3 and 4.	4	No discharge		
23	City of Driggs	56	IFRO	1,000,000	I	Upgrade Existing collection and Treatment System. Improve disinfection.	4	ID0020141	45	70

* Needs Category

I - Secondary Treatment

IVA - New Collector Sewers

II - Advanced Treatment

IVB - New Interceptor Sewers

III - Infiltration/Inflow Correction

V - Combined SewerOverflows

IIIB - Replacement/Rehabilitation

VI - Storm Sewer

WARNING: USE OF THIS LIST AS A MAILING LIST OR AS A TELEPHONE NUMBER LIST IS PROHIBITED BY IDAHO CODE SECTION 9-348 AND IS PUNISHABLE BY A CIVIL PENALTY OF UP TO \$1,000.

**ATTACHMENT III:
INTEGRATED PRIORITY RATING**

FINAL SCORE _____

PRIORITY YEAR _____

**GUIDANCE FOR INTEGRATED PRIORITY SYSTEM:
WATER QUALITY PROJECT RANKING
DEQ Water Pollution Control Loan Program**

Project Name: _____

Project Address (Street and/or P.O. Box): _____

City: _____ **Zip Code:** _____

Telephone: _____

Contact Person: _____

Date of Rating: _____

Project Rater: _____ **Regional Office:** _____

SECTION I - INTEGRATED PRIORITY SYSTEM

An integrated priority system will be used by the Department to annually allot available funds to water quality projects determined eligible for funding assistance under the water pollution control loan program in accordance with the Rules for Administration (16.01.12). Each water quality project will be ranked by the integrated priority system in accordance with this guidance.

Following in **Section I** are four major rating categories, **A, B, C and D**. Answer “**Yes**” to the rating category that best fits your project then answer the questions related to that category in the appropriate **subsection (A, B, C or D) in Section II**. If the subject project does not fit any of the rating categories (i.e., you answer “**NO**” to all four questions) then the project is not eligible for further funding considerations by the DEQ Loans Program.

A) Public Health Emergency or Public Health Hazard: Will the proposed project eliminate an officially declared or designated water-borne public health hazard or public health emergency?

_____Yes _____No If YES, go to page 2

B) Watershed Restoration: Will the proposed project address watershed restoration as identified in the *Unified Watershed Assessment and Restoration Priorities for Idaho*?

_____Yes _____No If YES, go to page 2

C) Watershed Protection from Impacts: Will the proposed project address watershed protection as identified in the *State Water Quality Standards* or the *Idaho Ground Water Quality Rule*?

_____Yes _____No If YES, go to page 5

D) Preventing Impacts to Uses: Will the proposed project addresses preventing watershed degradation?

_____Yes _____No If YES, go to page 6

*If you answered **Yes** to a category in this Section (Section I), please advance to Sections II and III and answer questions in the appropriate subsections.*

SECTION II - WATER QUALITY PROJECT RANKING

Only statewide initiatives or regional on-the-ground implementation project proposals that have answered “**Yes**” to a subsection in **Section I** may continue for ranking consideration under **Section II**.

A. Public Health Emergency or Public Health Hazard (Bypasses Section III)

Emergency*	<u>150</u>
No Emergency	<u>0</u>

* **Note:** An **emergency** is an **officially** declared or designated public health hazard or emergency that is a documented health threat certified by a Health District Board or Environmental Quality Board.

Section IIA: Points
(0 or 150 pts)

B. Watershed Restoration

The project implements best management practices or initiates construction or wastewater collection and treatment facilities as part of an approved TMDL, protects threatened waters identified through the States Nonpoint Source Management Program plan, or is part of a special water quality effort (i.e., Governors Bull Trout Conservation Plan, etc.). **Score the subject project under numbers 1 and 2 of Watershed Restoration.**

1. **Status** - Points can be assigned based upon the status in the TMDL schedule, priority of the listed 303(d) water, implications to threatened or endangered species, impacts to a sole source aquifer, impacts to an outstanding resource water or impacts to sensitive, or special resource ground water, or compliance with an NPDES permit. **Select a subpart (a., b, c or d) and complete a rating for the subject project.**

a. No Status - Not included on a current 303 (d) list, not on a TMDL schedule, not out of compliance with a NPDES permit, not part of a known special surface or groundwater category or listing, or does not effect listed threatened or endangered species. _____ 0 pts

b. Low Status - Project is located on a low priority 303(d) water body on the 8-year TMDL schedule (2005 or further out on the 8-year schedule) _____ 8 pts

- Status of the TMDL in project subbasin:

- TMDL completed but not approved	No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts
- TMDL approved by EPA	No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts
- TMDL Implementation Plan approved by DEQ	No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts

- Expected benefits to a sole-source aquifer and other ground water resources (based on available maps showing boundaries of sole source aquifers on Rathdrum Prairie, Eastern Snake River Plain, and Lewiston Basin).

Outside _____ 1 pt
 Borderline _____ 3 pts
 Within boundary _____ 5 pts

- Expected reduction in impacts to threatened and endangered Species.

Low _____ 1 pt
 Medium _____ 3 pts
 High _____ 5 pts

- Current level of compliance with NPDES and land application permits.

Low _____ 5 pts
 Medium _____ 3 pts
 High _____ 1 pt

Subtotal _____

c. Medium Status - Project is located on a medium priority 303(d) water body on the 8-year TMDL Schedule (2003 or 2004 on the 8-year schedule) _____ 12 pts

- Status of the TMDL in project subbasin:

- TMDL completed but not approved No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts
 - TMDL approved by EPA No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts
 - TMDL Implementation Plan approved by DEQ No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts

- Expected benefits to a sole-source aquifer and other ground water resources.

Low _____ 1 pt
 Medium _____ 3 pts
 High _____ 5 pts

- Expected reduction in impacts to threatened and endangered Species.

Low _____ 1 pt
 Medium _____ 3 pts
 High _____ 5 pts

- Current level of compliance with NPDES and land application permits.

Low _____ 5 pts
 Medium _____ 3 pts
 High _____ 1 pt

Subtotal _____

d. High Status - Project is located on a high priority 303(d) water body

according to the 8-year TMDL Schedule _____ 20 pts

- Status of the TMDL in project subbasin:
 - TMDL completed but not approved No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts
 - TMDL approved by EPA No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts
 - TMDL Implementation Plan approved by DEQ No _____ 0 pts / Yes _____ 5 pts

- Expected benefits to a sole-source aquifer and other ground water resources.

Low _____ 1 pt
Medium _____ 3 pts
High _____ 5 pts

- Expected reduction in impacts to threatened and endangered Species.

Low _____ 1 pt
Medium _____ 3 pts
High _____ 5 pts

- Current level of compliance with NPDES and land application permits.

Low _____ 5 pts
Medium _____ 3 pts
High _____ 1 pt

Subtotal _____

2. Potential for Restoration Points - Points are awarded according to the expected effectiveness of the project and the transferability of the demonstrated technologies to other parts of the State of Idaho. The proposed project will either restore designated or existing beneficial uses, reduce the severity of nonpoint source impacts, or the project will promote statewide nonpoint pollution reduction or remediation. **Select one subpart below.**

- a. No load reduction or effectiveness calculations provided _____ 0 pts
- b. Improvements are minor (ex. <25% estimated reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require substantial capital/manpower commitment. _____ 15 pts
- c. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored and the impacts are reduced (ex. >25% reduction but <75% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require moderate capital/ manpower commitment. _____ 30 pts
- d. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored or the impacts are reduced (ex. >75% reduction but <100% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require minimal capital/manpower commitment: _____ 50 pts

Section IIB: Points _____
(0 to 101 pts)

C. Watershed Protection from Impacts

Score the subject project under numbers 1, 2, and 3 of this section.

1. Points will be assigned based upon:

- the number of stream miles impacted;
- the number of lake/reservoir surface acres impacted;
- the extent of groundwater impacts to beneficial uses; or
- the ability of a statewide project to promote point or nonpoint source pollution reduction or mitigation.

Proposed project applicants must include a map showing the impact area of the proposed water quality projects to receive more than the minimal score.

Select a Subpart (a, b, c, or d) and complete the rating for the subject project.

- a. Low Impact** - Little evident impact is noted due to point or nonpoint source contribution or statewide NPS project initiatives (i.e., less than 5 miles or 200 acres affected or minor impacts to ground water). _____ 5 pts
- b. Moderate Impact** - Moderate impact is noted due to point- or nonpoint source contributions or statewide NPS project initiatives (i.e., approximately 5 miles or 200 acres effected or moderate impacts to ground water). _____ 15 pts
- c. High Impact** - Severe impact is noted due to point source (i.e., under administrative, or consent order) or nonpoint source contribution (i.e., more than 5 miles or 200 acres effected or severe impacts to ground water) or statewide NPS project initiatives. _____ 35 pts

2. Potential for Restoration Points - Points are awarded according to the expected effectiveness of the project and the transferability of the demonstrated technologies to other parts of the State of Idaho. The proposed project wills either restore designated or existing beneficial uses, reduce the severity of point- or nonpoint source impacts, or the project will promote statewide nonpoint pollution reduction or remediation. **Select one subpart below.**

- a. No load reduction or effectiveness calculations provided. _____ 0 pts
- b. Improvements are minor (ex. <25% estimated reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require substantial capital/manpower commitment. _____ 5 pts
- c. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored and the documented impacts are reduced (ex. >25% reduction but <75% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require moderate capital/manpower commitment. _____ 15 pts
- d. Designated or existing beneficial uses of surface or ground water are partially restored and the documented impacts are reduced (ex. >75% reduction but <100% reduction in pollutant load) or statewide project will require minimal capital/manpower commitment. _____ 35 pts

3. Nexus/benefit to municipality - Points are awarded based on the commitment of a municipality to directly benefit for implementing or financing a portion of the proposed

project. A municipality-driven project is awarded the maximum 30 points.

Community/Agency Support

- a. No support letters. _____ 0 pts
- b. One to two support letters. _____ 10 pts
- c. Three or more support letters OR municipal-driven project. _____ 30 pts

Section IIC: Points _____
(0 to 100 pts)

D. Preventing Impacts to Uses

Score project under numbers 1, 2, and 3 of this section.

1. **Points will be assigned based upon** the documented number of designated beneficial uses impacted by nonpoint source pollutants.

Select a Subpart (a, b, c, or d) and complete a rating for the subject project.

Number of Use Impacts

- a. No impacts _____ 0 pts
- b. One or two uses _____ 10 pts
- c. Three or four uses _____ 25 pts
- d. Four or more uses _____ 40 pts

2. **Nexus/benefit to municipality** - Points are awarded based on the commitment of a municipality for implementing or financing a portion of the proposed project. **(Select one subpart below.)**

Community/Agency Support

- a. No support letters. _____ 0 pts
- b. One to two support letters. _____ 20 pts
- c. Three or more support letters. _____ 40 pts

3. **State and National Priorities** - Points will be assigned based upon recognition of the special status of waters or uses of those waters.

Answer a, b, c, or any combination:

- a. **State Priorities** - The project impacts either a State Park or State Recreational Area, a blue ribbon fishery, water classified as a special or outstanding resource water, or designated as part of a sole source aquifer, an area of high ground water vulnerability, or the project enhances the State's nonpoint source management program. _____ 10 Pts
- b. **National Priorities** - A nonpoint source or statewide initiative project is intended to positively impact either a threatened or endangered species, a wilderness area, a Wild and Scenic River or a sole source aquifer. _____ 10 Pts
- c. **Not Applicable** _____ 0 Pts

Section IID: Points _____
(0 to 100 pts)

SECTION II - WATER QUALITY PROJECT RANKING SUBTOTAL POINTS =

(0 to 100 pts)

SECTION III - SECONDARY 'INCENTIVE' PROJECT RANKING

All projects are ranked under Section III criteria, which are established for use to further rank Water Quality Project Ranking from Section II of the Guidance. Answer the following set of questions specifically as it relates to the project. Each answer that receives points accordingly should be subtotaled for Section III and added to the score from Section II for "Grand Total Points." **Answer one per question and sum the cumulative in the Subtotal.**

1. Is project ready to proceed?

(For NPS Project ONLY _____ Yes = 11 pts; _____ No = 0 pts)

No Facility Plan	_____ 0 pts
Consultant hired for Facility Plan Preparation	_____ 3 pts
Draft Facility Plan	_____ 5 pts
Approved Facility Plan and Environmental Review Completed	_____ 7 pts
10% or more (Preliminary) Design Completed	_____ 9 pts

2. Resulting monthly user service (charges) rates as an outcome of the project (e.g., hardship, etc.).

up to \$20	_____ 3 pts
\$20 to \$30	_____ 6 pts
> \$30	_____ 9 pts

3. Is financial documentation in place to ensure payback assurance?

No Plan	_____ 0 pts
Bond council or financial consultant retained	_____ 5 pts
Legal instrument(s) in place (e.g., bond election, bylaws, etc.)	_____ 9 pts

4. Project will correct a water quality impact being created by current point or non-point wastewater disposal practices.

_____ 3, 6 or 9 pts

5. Project will correct an existing or potential health hazard (not emergency) being created by current point or non-point wastewater disposal practices.

_____ 7, 11 or 14 pts

Section III **Points** _____
(0 to 50 pts)

GRAND TOTAL POINTS _____
(0 to 150 pts)

**ATTACHMENT IV:
PROPOSED PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

FFY2004 IUP

Quarter Ending	Payments	Total
9/2004	\$ 258,872	\$ 258,872
12/2004	\$ 6,212,928	\$ 6,471,800

Payments are defined as increases to the amount of funds available from the Automated Clearinghouse (ACH).

**ATTACHMENT V:
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY
FOR
FY2005 WASTEWATER AND DRINKING WATER PRIORITY LISTS**

(This section will be added after the Public Hearing is conducted.)